

2010 CENSUS BUREAU PRESS BRIEFING

July 7, 2010

STAN ROLARK: Good afternoon. My name is Stan Rolark, and I'm the Chief of the Census Bureau's Public Information Office. I'd like to offer everyone here a warm welcome for coming today, and I guess warm must be an understatement for a day like today, as hot as it is outside. But we're very happy to have you here in this, our continuing series on the 2010 Census. Dr. Groves will focus today on America's progress, he'll offer his views on where we are in this process, and look ahead to operations to come. I'd like to direct your attention to the electronic tool kit, you can go to our website and get that at census.gov. I think everyone here has a press kit as well. When you go there you'll find the facts on Census operations. Also, we're going to show you, if I could, a video. We'll get to that in just a second.

But first I want to remind everyone that Dr. Groves presentation will be about twenty minutes, and then we'll have a Q&A session. We have folks in the audience and folks on the phone, so I'll go back and forth between the audience and the phone. I ask everyone to hold their questions to one question, depending upon the number of questions we have. If we don't have many questions, we can have a follow-up as well.

What I'd like to do first is show you a short video—it's two-and-a-half minutes—on our quality assurance operations.

[VIDEO]

Okay, with that, I'd like to bring Doctor Robert Groves, Director of the U.S. Census Bureau. Dr. Groves.

DR. GROVES: Thank you all for being here. It's great to see you again. I'm going to do two things today. One, I want to give you an updated status. And then I want to share with you stuff we're just starting to see that indicate quality aspects of the 2010 Census.

So let me begin. In a few days, I will have been in this position for one year. So it's tempting to look back on things with that perspective. And I recall, after a few months being in the position, identifying two big risks for the 2010 Census. One was our lack of knowledge; the uncertainty of how the American public was going to react a few months later when we asked them to participate in the Census. And the other big risk was a set of software developments and new management teams that were in place to guide the 2010 Census. How was that going to work?

Well I can say today that we really have evidence on how those potential risks played out. On the first risk—how would the American public react?—you and we now know that 72% of the occupied households, roughly, returned the mail questionnaire. And this was a glorious success, given the fact that all survey professionals expected a lower rate, given the consistent decline of survey cooperation throughout the decade. I also know today, and can announce, that we've essentially finished knocking on 47,000,000 household doors, and the cooperation of the American people, on the whole, matched that of the mail-back phase. They answered the questionnaire, they opened the door, and they agreed to provide the information in face-to-face form.

On the second risk—the software systems, the new management team—I can say honestly now that, although we had a very shaky start with these software systems, with management interventions that were wisely done from this team, with enormous dedication from a bunch of software engineers, we have successfully processed 47,000,000 forms through this software system that was designed to do that. It worked. It wasn't pretty, but it worked, and we have successfully completed that phase. We have a few tail-end things that we're finishing up.

As you noticed in that video, we're still doing things. And the best way to think about this I think, and to teach your audience about this, is that this is the phase where we don't add too many folks to the count, but we do a whole lot of scrutiny on how good the count is. We check and double check and triple check things. The whole purpose is to make sure we've gotten it right. We will make some changes, but the real purpose is to make sure we've got it right. And there are basically four operations where people are calling on households, and it's important for us to know this. What's radically different with this phase is the number of households being knocked on is really quite small. You can think of this country as consisting of about 135,000,000 households, the biggest operation that we're running is going to knock on about 8,000,000 doors. These are much smaller operations.

But your audience needs to know that some small number of households will get a call from us. So I want to go over those and give you a sense of the size of those by way of a status report, and then I want to reveal these hints of quality that we're starting to get from the operations.

The first operation is the biggest we'll operate, and that's called Coverage Follow-Up. That actually began in mid-April, and it should finish up by August 13th. We're calling on about 7.5 million households. This is exploiting an innovation in the 2010 Census. If you remember your form, there were two questions. One, is there someone at your house right now who normally doesn't live there? And then for every person you reported, we asked the question, does this person sometimes live elsewhere? For the houses that checked one of those boxes, we're going to call back and make sure, make double sure, that we've counted people once and only once. It is these complicated households where people are coming and going and living there sometimes and not other times that pose real challenges to get accurate counts, so we're calling back on those. We will pick up in those operations a small number of people who weren't counted at all; we'll bring them in through that follow-up call. We're going to find a few people who were actually

double counted—they were counted in two households—and we'll get the right household assigned to them. So that's the first operation: Coverage Follow-UP.

The second operation, The Vacant/Delete Check, is about the same size, about 8,000,000 households, and what we're doing there is going back on a set of households that we've visited over the past few weeks where, when an enumerator went up and knocked on the door, they determined, he or she determined, that that house was vacant on April 1. We want to make sure that's right. We're going to double check that. We're going to go back to that house and redetermine [sic] whether that's a correct designation for the house. And then there are other houses on our list that went out over the past few weeks, and when they went out to locate the house, they saw an empty lot, the house had been destroyed, or they couldn't find the house. It looked like our list was inappropriate. And they marked that as a Delete. We're going to go back out to those and make sure we got that right before we finalize the operation.

The third operation is called Field Verification. It will began August 6th and it will go through early September. This is really our last operation in terms of time. It's pretty small. We're going to about 400,000 addresses. This is a check on a set of cases that is, itself, the result of our efforts to count everyone. So, in March and April, if you didn't get a form, we said you could go to a local facility and pick up what we call a Be Counted form. People did that. Not too many people, but people did it. And on that form we asked you to write your address. We've examined every one of those forms already. And sometimes, when we look at the address, we can't match it to anything we have on our list. On those kinds of cases, we're going to go back out. We're going out to that house and we're going to make sure we can find it. We can understand the address, we know what block it's in, and we can place it correctly in that block. So that will last through early September.

And then, the final operation has been going on as long as the Non-Response Follow-Up has gone on. This is a Key Quality Assurance we do. Every enumerator that has worked

for us over the last few weeks has been subject to a reinterview [sic] process. A completely independent team of enumerators goes out on a fraction of the cases that have been visited and redoes the work. And then we compare the results of the original interview and the second interview. If it doesn't match, it's a flag, and we send that back to the local office. We investigate every case. If it's an innocent error, and a small discrepancy, we have rules on how to handle the two cases. If we see a pattern of behavior, we will redo cases that don't match. And we've done that. We've been doing that over the past few weeks. This involves about two million interviews that have been done over the past few weeks. We're in the middle of this reinterview [sic] process; we're 76% through. We are using this both to check on the quality of responses and also as a check on whether there's any falsification or fabrication of data going on among our enumerator team. And I'll give you the results of that in a minute.

So those four operations, albeit rather small operations, will have us out on the streets of America over the next few weeks, and people need to know that. I have a request for those people. Some of these people have received knocks on their door repeatedly, and if you think through what I just said, some of these people may have been called on multiple times. We ask for their cooperation, their patience, and their understanding that our motivation on this is to do the best 2010 Census we can. It's all focuses on getting the highest quality we can.

One another note that is useful to make. If you're out there, or if your audience has the following thoughts, "Gee, I don't believe I got a mail questionnaire. I know I didn't send it back. I haven't had anyone knock on my door. I'm afraid I'm not counted." We still have a facility for you, an 800 number. 866-872-6868. If you press the right buttons, I'm told, rather slowly, you will get connected to an interviewer who will take your data right on the phone. And that's still open. That'll be open until the end of July, roughly. So those are the pleas to the American public.

I'll now turn to the second part of this conference. We're starting to get glimmers of the answer that is the big question that all of us will have over the next few months, and that is, How good is the 2010 Census? Everything, I will say, is preliminary. It's subject to change. And if any of you know how the Census Bureau scrutinizes its own work, these numbers will change somewhat over the coming months. But I thought you deserve to know these as we know them. And let me first note that there are three basic ways that you can answer the question; one of the qualities of the 2010 Census. One could be labeled a process-oriented approach. Did the things you say you wanted to do in the 2010 census work the way you expected them to? So, that's the first thing, and we can do that here. Another one is to compare the results of the thing you're evaluating to something else that is intended to do the same thing. We don't have those data yet. We will have another comparison, another estimate, of the U.S. Population in 2010 from demographic analysis later in the Fall, and then, in 2012, we'll have a big sample survey that will be matched to the Census to see whether we tended to undercount certain folks, but we don't have those data yet.

So what we really have now are the inklings of process-oriented quality indicators, and I want to go through those. And the way we think about these, is first, do we have design features of the 2010 Census that professionally we were counting on to work in a better fashion than the 2000 Census component equivalents worked. Let me just go through those. You know some of these already, those of you who've been following this story.

This was a short form only census. In 2000, the short-form had a response rate about ten percentage points than the then long-form. We were counting on this. This was part of the success. This is really the only way we achieved that 72% mail out response rate, I'm pretty sure. Secondly, remember we had a bilingual form that was sent to areas that were disproportionately Spanish-only speakers. We've analyzed those data. That thing worked the way we wanted it to work. It increased the return rate in high prevalence Spanish-speaking areas, we're pretty sure. It's a complicated analysis that will take longer to do, but we're pretty sure that thing worked the way we wanted it to.

I already showed you in an earlier conference that the replacement questionnaire worked. And it worked in a very important way, for those of us who want to count every one once and only once. We were able to increase the participation rate in the hard-to-count areas through that replacement questionnaire. These are disproportionately the lowest responding areas if we hadn't done that. So we created less variation in response rates. That was good.

We have recent results on how good the address list is. These are just hot off the press. There are two things that happened when we went out on Non-response follow-ups. An interviewer would go out, try to find a house that we mailed to, and find that there was nothing there. And that interviewer would mark that as a Delete. If we had an address list with tons of those, we would say, "that's not a very good address list. We have a lot of junk on the list." We deleted about 4.1 million cases in 2010. In 2000, we deleted 6,000,000. We like that contrast. Right? It looks the list is cleaner on the Delete side.

The flip side of that is additional addresses. The interviewer goes out, we train them, if they're calling on address for non-response follow-ups, and they notice that a single family structure has been turned into apartments, check whether all the apartments are on the list. If not, add them in. We had fewer adds proportionately this time than the other Census. Now there are two interpretations of that. This isn't a hard quality indicator, because we must rely on the interviewers to follow the training guidelines to pick up the adds. If they don't follow the training guidelines, that could've produced this result. The same result, however, would obtain if they followed the training guidelines and the list was more complete than it was last time. But those are the results on adds.

That video that you just saw talked about Coverage Follow-Up. This is an effort to make sure we've counted people once and only once. We did an operation sort of like that in 2000. It affected 2.5 million households. This time, we're doing it on 7.5 million

households. These are complicated households. And by calling them back, we're pretty sure we'll get better counts, more accurate counts. I like that result.

And then finally, I mentioned this reinterview [sic] program that we're doing. In the 2000 cycle, we were able to do reinterviews [sic] on 75% of the interviewers. 75% of the enumerators got at least one case in their workload redone and checked. We're essentially at 100% now; we're 99. something. That's a good thing. That means we can say honestly that a piece of every Census worker's work was redone, independently, and checked to see if we found any departures from training guidelines. We like that result.

Let me give you a few other things that we now know, and we'll get harder data as we go on. As expected, we're finding more vacant houses. This Vacant/Delete Check will really nail that number, but right now we stand, as of today, we found about 14.3 million vacant homes versus 9.9 in the 2000 cycle. This fits everything we know about this economy, the foreclosure problem, vacant houses, people moving out of homes that they were attempting to purchase.

Another finding. When we finish this Non-Response Follow-Up, if you think about it, we've gotten forms from 72% of the occupied units, and then we knocked on everybody else's door. We've knocked on all the doors we think are out there, except for a few that we're going to visit over the next few weeks. The proportion of the houses, occupied houses, that we now have counts on, population counts, is about the same as 2000. That's a good thing. The characteristics of how we got those counts are a little different between 2000 and 2010. There are two ways we learn how many people live in a house in Non-Response Follow-Up. We knock on the door, someone answers, and we do the interview. Failing that, we appeal to a building manager or neighbor to ask about occupancy. The proportion of the cases this time, in 2010, from which we obtain through building managers and neighbors is higher than it was in 2000. This fits the expectation we had with regard to the cooperation of the American public. Some of these are cases-- There are really two important reasons why this occurs. We're having difficulty contacting

people; people are rarely at home. And then those who are reluctant. So we go to a building manager or neighbor, and that rate is a little higher this year. We'll know more later on those numbers. So that's just a glimmer of what we're starting to see to answer the question of, "So how did it go?" basically. And you can make your own judgments about how good those signals are.

I want to say a word about cost. Again, from a personal perspective, since I've been there, we've now completed eleven different operations; all the components of doing the Census. Every one of those operations has finished on schedule. Cumulatively, we are significantly under budget for this 2010 Census. Those are two good things. They are really the result of the hard work of the people at the Census Bureau, and this large number of temporary workers we've employed over the past few weeks.

So I want to end, before we go into questions, with some thank you's. First, we've had enormous support of about a quarter of a million partners throughout the country who made the big difference in this Census. These are people who did it because they cared about a good Census for their group; they cared about their community. I thank them again. They have donated their time. They have donated space. 35,000 locations donated where we did training; didn't pay a dime for that. We think that's close to \$1,000,000,000 that was donated by these folks to us, to the country, in order to have a good Census, and we thank them.

I thank those people who mailed back the forms and put up with us when we knocked on their doors if they hadn't mailed it back. And then, you know, we are entering a phase where we are ending the employment, or the use of a whole lot of people. We had 565,000 workers knocking on doors throughout the country. I've read blogs of these people, I've received emails of these people—the vast majority of these people are doing it to help this country. It is a public service that they have provided all of us, and we need to thank them. Many of them desperately needed the work and the income, and we know this is a sad time where that income supplied from the Census Bureau will be ending for

many of them. So I thank them for their service to the country, and I wish them well in their futures.

And then let me finally end-- If you have a sense of the atmosphere of a place like the Census Bureau around the decennial census, you'll never forget it. These are moments, days, weeks, where people are working full-time, 24/7. The parking lot is full seven days a week. People are going way beyond the call, and we are honored to have a set of employees like that here in Washington, and throughout in the regional offices.

So let me stop and field questions.

STAN ROLARK: Before you ask questions, let me go over just a few things. When you have a question, please give your name and your media affiliation. And for the folks on the phone, please indicate to the operator that you have a question. So first I'll start with a question in the room.

UNKNOWN Q: Can you give us an idea of the numbers and the types of errors you have found in reinterviewing [sic] people, and will charges be brought against anyone, any enumerator for making up stuff?

GROVES: So the first question is the kinds of errors. Some of these are completely innocent, and the result of reaching different people in the reinterview than the interview. Let's say you have a three-person household. The interview is done with the mother and wife of the three. Let's say it's a husband, a wife, and an eighteen-year-old. The interview is done with the wife, it's recorded, we put it into our system, and it's chosen for a reinterview case. The reinterviewer goes back, completely independently, he or she has no idea what happened, knocks on the door, and the husband comes to the door. He fills out the questionnaire. You get a difference. The husband thinks that the son is not eighteen, but nineteen or seventeen, or something like that, and we pick up that difference

in our computer matches. That'll blow up as a flag, and we'll check that out. So that's a completely innocent thing.

The things we're really looking for are really much more severe departures. A kind of mismatch that implies that the interviewer actually didn't do the case, fabricated the case. I can say now-- We have about 47,000,000 households, we have about 565,000 interviewers, it looks like the number of cases that we judged as so severely mismatched that it could've been a fabrication incident is less than a thousand out of those 565,000. This is, by the way, below what we expected. And we feel good about that, because we know we've sampled work from every interviewer, essentially.

Now, the second question is about prosecution. We are not in the prosecution game, as you know. When there are severe, endemic, large amounts of fabrication, then that's a matter where we would call the Inspector General, if they weren't aware of it already. They do an independent investigation, and then they would make a recommendation to the relevant U.S. attorney to prosecute or not prosecute.

ROLARK: We'll now move to the phones. Is there a question, operator, on the phone? Operator, can you hear me? No question. Question in the audience. I'll also ask you to wait for a mic when you have a question.

ALLISON BURNS: Allison Burns with Cox Television. USA Today reported this morning this will likely be the last Census done exclusively by mail and home visits. Do you envision that most people would be filling out their census forms online the next time around, and do you think that would save money?

GROVES: Okay, this is a complicated question. First of all, I'm assuming you're talking about the US Census only. There are other countries that use different methods than we do. But thinking forward, I think there are things that we can say. One, in my personal opinion, my professional judgment and those of many, we must have an Internet

option in the next Census. Having said that, however, I know the research on this, and I'm pretty sure I can speculate that this won't be the silver bullet. Even when the Internet is used as an option in large-scale surveys or censuses in completely-wired countries, more wired than we are, not 100% of the people choose that. There are some people who, even though they have Internet access, say, "Gee, I'm not sure I like doing this. I'd rather talk to someone or I'd rather fill it out on paper." Therefore, the speculation is the participation rate, through the Internet alone, may not go up greatly.

The vision that many people have about censuses and surveys is that we ought to give people a lot of different options. You may prefer a particular way of doing it, and we have to make sure you have the option of doing that. Others would prefer a different method. So, I think the vision that we're building for the 2020 Census, it'll be a lot of different things. If we're really smart, we'll choose the number of different ways to do that, so that the overall percentage of people who do it without having to send someone to their door, goes higher. Because a large portion of the data collection costs of the Census are the labor costs of sending people out to knock on doors.

[off-microphone]

Yea. To the extent that it raises the participation rate, it would save money. Any way we can raise the participation rate without using human beings to knock on doors will do well. I can speculate also that there will be a mail component for the 2020 Census, if we still have a Postal system. We'll use that. Because that's very inexpensive, and it works. Problem is, it doesn't work for everybody.

ROLARK: Do we have any questions on the phone Operator?

OPERATOR: The line is now open.

EDWIN MAURO: What process is the Census using to remove duplicate records of homeless individuals who are recounted by enumerators, and for which no name, birth date, or ethnicity is collected.

ROLARK: Okay, and we didn't get your name and media affiliation, can you give that to us please?

EDWIN MAURO: I'm Edwin Mauro with TNSnews.com.

GROVES: It's a great question. Let me paraphrase the question so I'm sure I'm doing it right. We attempt to count those folks are nontraditionally housed, including those who live and sleep in outdoor locations in a special operation three days at the end of March. This is a very challenging thing if you think about it for a minute. The way we do it is to both visit service providers where the homeless would seek services: soup kitchens, health services, shelters, and so on. And then one night, we actually go to outdoor locations.

It is feasible, as the caller noted, that we would count someone both at a soup kitchen one day and then we would visit an encampment, or a group of people sleeping under an overpass. When we visit them in the evening, it is very common that those people are worried about their own safety. They protect themselves in various ways, to make sure they're not harmed physically. It is common that when we visit those outdoor locations, that we can't get the names and age and race of each individual. They say essentially, "We don't want to talk to you." As a last resort, in those cases, we enumerate, we count, Person 1, Person 2-- that's about the best we can do.

What the caller notes is that sometimes Person #13 under the overpass may have been counted in the soup kitchen. We have no way, unfortunately, of knowing that in that circumstance. That's a weakness of the enumeration of homeless people: we may have duplicates: We also know that we have a lot missed homeless. We did not even attempt to measure homeless people who lived by themselves, in a tent, deep in the woods, miles

away from anyone else. We don't know they're there. We rely on local officials and local community organizers to find clusters of homeless, and that's the way we do it. This is a weakness in the homeless count.

ROLARK: Questions in the room? Yea.

ANDREA ISHAL: I'm Andrea Ishal, ...(inaudible) Reporters. I wanted to follow up on one question that came before, and then ask one of my own. You had said that there were 1,000 cases-- was that 1,000 individuals out of 585,000, or was it a thousand cases out of the 47,000,000.

GROVES: What I wanted to say—and we're still doing this, so I don't know the final numbers—but we're confident that it will be less than 1,000 people who, in reinterviewing cases they did, we have judged falsified those cases. That's 1,000 out of 565,000 roughly.

ANDREA ISHAL: I also wanted to ask you about the cases of incident assaults, violence that the census-takers are facing. I know the number was twice what it was in 2000, do you have an up-to-date account now, and can you reflect for a moment—you've done this in an earlier conversation—but now that more time has passed, about the effect of the sort of anti-government mood and climate in this country on this Census.

GROVES: What's the volume in the why, I believe that's your question. I believe the up-to-date figure is up to 500 incidents. So that sounds like a terribly high number, and it is indeed the case. I've read the characteristics of each of those incidents. Some of them are minor things—an angry duck attacked one of our numerators and she has bites on her ankles, she will survive—but others are horrible events. Well, there have been carjackings, there have been assaults, our folks have been shot at-- a variety of things like that.

Now, how do you absorb information like that? I think it's appropriate, although each of these is an individual tragedy, to ask the question "What is the volume of this? Is this way above what others are experiencing?" We don't have any evidence of that. The way we think about this is, we have knocked about 100,000,000 times on doors. Most of the 47,000,000 households we've knocked on twice. You have to call at least twice to get the interview. So, 100,000,000 events took place of our folks knocking on the door, and we have 500 of those 100,000,000 that produced these outcomes. That's a very, very small percentage. Is it bigger than 2000? Really hard for us to figure out, because we're tracking everything this time. We have Google searches going on all the time for really minor incidents. We don't think we had such a scrutiny in 2000. The number that's mostly cited in 2000 is 180, so I'm pretty sure that's an underestimate of what was there.

Now, your other question is the why. I don't see a pattern. Maybe others do. There are a variety of motivations that you can impute to the offenders in these cases, but its really our imputation of those motivations, right? They generally don't reveal why they did these things to our folks. I can't make a big case that this is a huge anti-government activity that motivated this.

ROLARK: Okay. And let me remind everyone, if you can just ask one question. We have a number of questions on the phone, so let's go to the phone.

OPERATOR: Our next question comes from Farida Jaliat of Radio Bilingual.

FARIDA JALIAT: Hi, this is Farida Jaliat from Radio Bilingual, and my question is about-- There are a couple of nonprofit groups that we've heard from that are still trying to tell people to count themselves by calling one of the Census numbers and participate in the Census, but we've also heard from other sources that there isn't a possibility-- that people can't be counted anymore. And I just want to ask you what is the situation with people who were not counted but want to participate in the Census?

GROVES: As I said in my opening remarks, to the end of July, that 800 number, 866-872-6868 is the number to call. Now, when you do that, you're going to get one of those voice recordings that asks you to press certain numbers. And we have discovered that, if you're real quick pressing those numbers, the system doesn't react well. You need to slowly hit the numbers, and then you'll be connected to a person that can do the interview.

ROLARK: You can also get that 866 number from our website, 2010census.gov.
Question? Yes.

BRIAN BERRY: I'm Brian Berry from EuroPolitics. I'm just wondering on the issue of the whole illegal immigrants filling out the forms, have you any way of measuring how persuasive or how successful in getting people who are living here illegally to fill in their Census forms?

GROVES: We will never know this perfectly. We will know more than we know now. So what the analysis will do on this, I'm sure, is to examine the action of folks in areas where our prior data suggested large numbers of the Hispanic population. We won't know the documented—whether they had papers or not. We just know ethnicity. And then they'll see if that's related to their levels of cooperation. We'll never know this for sure, but that would be one indirect way of doing it.

We have our feelers out to our partners throughout the country, and have throughout the time. I think one of the things that was an antidote to that was the incredible organization of the Latino community around the country, to communicate the importance of participation in the 2010 Census regardless of your documentation status. So that's another intervention in society against the think that you raise, and so it'll be a net effect that we'll be looking at. But we'll never know this for sure. We can only get hints of it by looking at those variations in cooperation.

ROLARK: Okay, let's move to the phones. We have a question on the phone operator?

OPERATOR: We have another question, and that question comes from Jeff Cooner of Orlando Centennial. Your line is now open.

JEFF COONER: You mentioned, Mr. Groves, the cost of door-to-door enumeration, and I wanted to know how much that costs to knock on those doors? You mentioned that the whole operation is under budget, and I wanted to know what that number was.

GROVES: On the first one, we don't have the per case numbers yet, and frankly we still have a few things to do, but we'll-- I promise you we'll give you all that in a full report when we have it. The number, just for talking purposes, in talking about the marginal cost of calling on a case and doing an interview is about a \$57 a household or about \$25 a person. And those are numbers that we're still working with. We'll refine those numbers based on our experience as soon as we collect all the data.

And then you had a second question, but I forgot what it was.

JEFF COONER: The second question was, you were talking about being under budget, so I wanted to know what the budget was and what we actually spent.

GROVES: Yea, yea. Well, again, we're not sure on this. But we're coming in at the Non-Response Follow-Up stage at about 70%-75% of the budget. We're not through with that yet, so we're not able to report on that. But that's a significant cost savings, we're sure. The why of those cost savings are important to note, too. Part of it is our workload was lower than we were prepared to do. These are good things. We had less cases than we were ready to call on; that we thought we'd have to call on. The second thing that happened was, we're now pretty sure, that the work of this labor force that we engaged was just smoother. We got cases in faster than we thought. We think the productivity was greater. I've noted several times that we are blessed. If there's any

beneficiary of this horrible recession we're going through, it's us. We have people with very high skills and great job experience, great team workers who are working for us. And they made this happen. So, it's a testament to their commitment. It's nothing about us, I think. We had great people working for us this time.

ROLARK: Question in the room, and we've got a mic coming to you.

MAX CACTUS: Hi, Dr. Groves. Max Cactus from Federal News Radio and WTLR here in Washington. You mentioned in one of your responses earlier that, and obviously it's ten years down the road and a lot can happen between now and then, but you've said that, or at least you seemed to think that there would be some sort of Internet-based or Online-based option for people to fill out their counting forms. And I'm wondering-- One source of heartburn for your predecessors were the handheld computers. Do you foresee some sort of handheld technology being out there with the enumerators who are going to be responsible for the 2020 Census, and when do you think you or whoever will be in charge of the Census will start thinking about those kinds of decisions?

GROVES: Well, let me first note, that a major focus of our discussions now on the 2020 Census are cost-related discussions. We must reduce the cost of measuring the population in the decennial Census. And we are diagnosing, we are dissecting, the cost of the cycle to see how we can do better. I'm a firm believer that we can reduce cost in the planning phase. We can be more efficient through integration of systems, through the use of our other infrastructure, to build in tests for 2020 into our existing data collection and operations, to reduce the marginal cost of those. It is quite likely that there will still be a face-to-face component in the 2020 Census. All the neat ideas of technology that I love and cherish and will push have weaknesses for certain parts of the population. They don't cover them well. Now, 2020 is ten years out. The world will change.

But I think it's easy to speculate that there will still be a portion of the population—we were just talking about the homeless population a minute ago—there is undoubtedly

going to be a portion of the population that will need face-to-face contact to get the interviews. Then, the question is, how can you save money without hurting quality on that phase? Handheld computers are very attractive, because they allow you to monitor work, to transmit completed work, to check work as you're getting it done. So, I think it's quite likely. And, if you think about it, almost all of our surveys now are using computer assistance for face-to-face interviews. We know how to do this.

I think it's quite likely that the 2020 Census face-to-face component will have a device that has a lot of intelligence attached to it and will assist the interviewer doing their work. Whether we'll call it a handheld or not-- it may be a wearable device. It may just look like a jacket. We have no idea what it's going to look like. So, a handheld is going to be "So 2010" by the time we talk about the 2020 Census. We'll have a different word for it, but it'll be there.

ROLARK: We have time for one more question on the phone and one in the room.
Question on the phone?

OPERATOR: We do have a question, and that question comes from Lucia Mutacani from Reuters.

LUCIA MUTACANI: Yes, I'm Lucia Mutacani from Reuters. I just wanted to find out how many temporary workers do you have on your payroll now?

GROVES: Oh, rats. 125,000, I'm told from the communication staff. Is that now or next week? I think that's now. We are going down. When the Vacant/Delete Check begins, there'll be a little rise; we're in a lull period right now. And then it will go consistently down through the first week of September, and then it really goes down. It's that first week of September that we're doing that final Field Verification Operation.

ROLARK: We have one more question in the room, anyone have a question?

SARA HASAID: Hi, Sara Hasaid from AFP. You mentioned that the number of cases in which you had to appeal to a landlord or a building manager to get information was higher this time around. Can you give me any sense of actually what those figures are and why that might be?

GROVES: I can. And it's roughly 21% or 22% of the 47,000,000 that we went on to knock on the door. And if you look, it's a bit of apples and oranges. But if you look at the 2000 rate, that was about 17%, so it's a little higher. Did you have a second question?

[off mic]

There are a lot of different reasons. This tracks trends and surveys. For those of you who know a little about surveys, you know it's harder to get a hold of us than it used to be. People are at home less frequently, for a lot of complicated reasons. These 47,000,000 households, by the way, are the households that chose not to return the mail questionnaire. These are really busy people. And so that's part of it. And there's a reluctance in that contrast between 17% and 22% that we don't know the components of yet. People who open the door, they're at home, but they say, "I don't want to do this." And we go back repeatedly, we send different enumerators, and as a last resort, then we'll ask a building manager or a neighbor.

ROLARK: Okay. I'd like to thank everyone for participating today, and let me remind you as well, if you need further information you can go to our website: 2010census.gov, and get an electronic tool kit there, or you can call the Public Information Office at 301-763-3691. Thank You.

END OF PRESENTATION